

University of Groningen

The Groningen Identity Development Scale (GIDS)

Kunnen, Saskia

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Early version, also known as pre-print

Publication date:

2014

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kunnen, S. (2014). *The Groningen Identity Development Scale (GIDS): Norm tables and analyses*.
Faculteit Gedrags- en Maatschappijwetenschappen.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

The Groningen Identity Development Scale (GIDS)

Norm tables and analyses

Saskia Kunnen,
Internal publication of the Dept. of Developmental Psychology,
University of Groningen, the Netherlands
2012

1. Development of Norm tables

In this document norm scores are given for the sub scales of the GIDS (Groningen Identity Development Scale). These norms are based on the data of three groups of students of applied and academic universities in the north of the Netherlands. These groups differ with respect to the year in which they were assessed (1995, 2002 and 2012), with regard to gender, to the distribution of the studies they did, the level of education (applied versus academic), and with regard to the type of rewards they received for participating. Anova analysis showed that the scores of the three groups were comparable: for none of the sub scales the significance of the difference was below 0.15, most significance levels were between 0.5 and 0.9, and there is no meaningful pattern in the differences. For that reason we decided to calculate the norms on the combined data. The complete group consists of 43 male and 108 female participants with a mean age of 19.1 and an age range between 17.5 and 22 years.

The group from 1995 (45 participants, 19 male, 26 female) are first- and second year students of a broad range of academic studies. The mean age is 19.7, the range is 18-22 years. As far as we know they did not receive payment.

The group from 2002 (89 participants, 16 male, 73 female) are first year psychology students. The mean age is 18.9, the range is 17.5-22 years. The students received credit points for their participation.

The group from 2012 (17 participants, 8 male and 9 female) are first- and second year students of a broad range of applied and academic studies. The mean age is 19.5, the range is 18-21 years. The participants received €7,50 cash for two interviews of 2 hours.

We found no significant relationship with any of the sub scales and age. Several scales showed a significant effect for gender. For sub scales with a difference between males and females that is below $p=0.15$, norm tables are computed both per gender and for the whole group.

Table 1. Relation between commitment and exploration scores, and age and gender.

	Age	Sexe differences		
	Correlation with age	male	female	significance
Study C	.01	25.5	25.9	.77
Study E	-.03	14.6	16	.08*
Parents C	-.13	24.9	26.1	.32
Parents E	.12	9.9	12.1	.01**
Philosophy of Life C	.10	24.9	24.6	.79
Philosophy of Life E	.08	14.6	13.9	.44
Friends C	.06	27.3	27.6	.76
Friends E	-.01	10.0	12.0	.01**
Personal Characteristics C	-.15	24.7	25.1	.69
Personal Characteristics E	.14	14.6	15.7	.21
Intimate Relation C	-.01	22.3	25.9	.01**
Intimate Relation E	.04	14.0	14.1	.92
Global Identity C	-.08	24.1	27.3	.11*
Global Identity E	.14	12.5	12.7	.83

* = $p < 0.15$; ** = $p < 0.05$

Table 2. Mean commitment- and exploration scores for the three groups

Domain	1995 (n=45)	2002 (n=89)	2012 (n=17)	F-value	p
Study C	26,2	25,3	27,2	0,58	0,56
Study E	15,4	15,8	14,7	0,57	0,56
Parents C	25,4	25,9	26,3	0,131	0,90
Parents E	11,9	11,3	11,2	0,30	0,74
Philosophy of Life C	25,2	24,3	24,9	0,24	0,79
Philosophy of Life E	14,9	13,9	12,7	1,33	0,27
Friends C	28,0	27,2	27,7	0,29	0,75
Friends E	10,7	11,9	11,1	1,12	0,33
Personal Characteristics C	25,7	25,2	22,2	1,83	0,16
Personal Characteristics E	15,4	15,4	15,6	0,01	0,99
Intimate Relation C	25,0	24,6	26,1	0,29	0,75
Intimate Relation E	14,4	14,1	13,0	0,61	0,55
Global Identity C	-	26,6	27,6	0,00	0,97
Global Identity E	-	12,6	13,2	0,19	0,67

Table 3. Distribution of studies

Major	frequency
law	7
sociology	4
psychology	97
mathematics	2
business	7
history	6
Dutch language	1
SJD HBO	1
facility management HBO	12
hotelschool HBO	1
medicine	4
bewegingswetenschappen	1
architectuur	1
american studies	7

Table 4. Distribution of age per 6 months

Age in month	Frequency	Valid Percent
210	7	4.6
216	42	27.8
222	11	7.3
228	31	20.5
234	14	9.3
240	21	13.9
246	1	0.7
252	9	6.0
258	5	3.3
264	9	6.0
270	1	0.7
Total	151	100.0

Table 5. Mean and median per domain of the whole sample

Domain	Mean	Median
StudyWork Commitment	25.8	27
StudyWork Exploration	15.6	15
Parents Commitment	25.8	27
Parents Eploration	11.5	11
Philosophy of Life CommitmentC	24.6	26
Philosophy of Life Exploration	14.1	14
Friends Commitment	27.5	28
Friends Exploration	11.4	12
Personal Characteristic Commitment	25.0	26
Personal Characteristics Exploration	15.4	15
Intimate Relation Commitment	24.9	27
Intimate Relation Exploration	14.1	14
Global identity Commitment (n=106)	26.6	30
Global identity Exploration (n=105)	12.7	13

Table 6. Percentile scores of exploration and commitment in the different domains (n=145)

Percentile	StudyWork Commitment	StudyWork Exploration	StudyWork Exploration male	StudyWork Exploration female
10	15	10	8	8
20	20	12	10.6	10.8
30	23	13	12	12.2
40	25	14	14	14
50	27	15	15	15
60	29	17	16	16
70	30	18	18	17.8
80	32	19	18	18
90	34	21	20.7	20.6

Percentile	Parents Commitment	Parents Exploration	Parents Exploration male	Parents Exploration female
10	16	6	5	7
20	19	7	6	9
30	22	9	7	10
40	25	10	7.6	10
50	27	11	9	11
60	29	12	11	12
70	31	13	12	14
80	32	15	14	15,2
90	34	18	15.6	18,1

Percentile	Philosophy of Life Commitment	Philosophy of Life Exploration
10	14	7,2
20	19	10
30	21	11
40	23	12
50	26	14
60	28	16
70	29	17
80	31	18
90	32,8	20

percentile	Friends Commitment	Friends Exploration	Friends Exploration male	Friends Exploration female
10	21	6	4.4	7
20	23	7	6	8
30	25	9	7	9.7
40	27	10	8	11
50	28	12	9	12
60	30	13	11	13
70	31	14	12	14
80	33	15	15	15
90	34	17	18.6	17

percentile	Personal Characteristic Commitment	Personal Characteristics Exploration
10	16	8
20	19.4	11
30	22	13
40	24	14
50	26	15
60	28	17
70	29	18
80	31	20
90	33	22

percentile	Intimate Relation Commitment	Intimate Relation Commitment male	Intimate Relation Commitment female	Intimate Relation Exploration
10	13	12	13.9	8
20	18	14	19	10
30	21	17	23	11
40	24	19.6	26	13
50	27	22	27	14
60	28	24.4	29	15
70	30	28	31	16
80	32.6	31.2	33	18
90	33	33.6	33.1	20

percentile	Global identity Commitment	Global identity Commitment Male	Global identity Commitment Female	Global identity Exploration
10	12,7	12.5	12.6	4,6
20	20	14	20.6	9,2
30	25	20.5	26	11
40	28	25	28.2	12
50	30	25.5	31	13
60	32	28	32	14
70	32	31	33	15
80	33	32	33	17
90	34	33	35	20

Note: If the difference between male and female below $p=0.15$, norms are given for the sexes separately and combined.

In the 2012 group a new domain is introduced: leisure time. Below the scores for this domain are given.

Table 6. Percentile scores Leisure (N=17)

	Leisure Commitment	Leisure Exploration
10	15,4	7,8
20	21,8	8,6
30	24,4	10,4
40	26	12
50	27	13
60	27,8	14
70	30,2	17,8
80	31	20,6
90	32,2	24,2

2. Analysis of GIDS scores

Reliability of the scales

We computed the alpha over the psychology students in the first and the second wave.

Table 2.1. Reliability (alpha) over the first year psychology students in wave 1 and wave 2.

	Commitment	Exploration	N
Wave 1			
Philosophy of life	0.78	0.74	101
Parents	0.81	0.82	101
Friends	0.77	0.72	101
Study	0.84	0.76	101
Self	0.78	0.81	100
Relations	0.81	0.80	101
Global	0.86	0.82	98
Wave 2			
Philosophy of life	0.82	0.73	92
Parents	0.82	0.78	90/91
Friends	0.78	0.78	91
Study	0.85	0.75	90/91
Self	0.82	0.74	90
Relations	0.84	0.72	90
Global	0.81	0.80	88

Effect of interviewer on GIDS scores

A commonly heard argument against the GIDS is that the interview is expected to be sensitive to experimenter-influence. To investigate this effect we compared test-retest correlations between waves in which the students have been interviewed twice by the same interviewer, and waves in which most students had different interviewers. We could do this because student interviewers participated for one year, thus they did two interviews: wave 1 and 2, or 3 and 4, or 5 and 6.

The analyses have been carried out for a subsample of the participants in the longitudinal study into identity development. Only those students are included in the analysis who participated for at least four waves. At wave 1, all subjects were 1st year psychology students between age 18 and 23, 30 women and 6 men.

Table 2.2: correlations between commitment scores at the 2nd and 3rd wave), in which interviewers in general were different, and at the 3rd and 4th wave, all interviews were done by the same interviewers)

Domain	commitments		Exploration	
	Wave 2-3	Wave 3-4	Wave 2-3	Wave 3-4
1 life philosophy	0.64	0.60	0.63	0.61
2 parents	0.63	0.61	0.44	0.70

3 friends	0.42	0.41	0.50	0.55
4 study-work-leisure	0.67	0.51	0.61	0.67
5 personal characteristics	0.77	0.40	0.66	0.65
6 intimate relationships	0.55	0.75	0.39	0.71

Conclusion: the correlation between wave 2 and 3 is not systematically lower than the correlation between wave 3 and 4, thus the change in interviewer does not contribute to the variance.

We repeated the analyses with the exclusion of the students who were interviewed by the main experimenter during all the waves. The correlations between wave 1 and 2 are based on the whole sample of 89 subjects. The correlations between wave 3 and 4 and between 2 and 3 are based on the subsample that continued for more than two waves minus the 8 students that were interviewed by the same interviewer. See table 2.3.

Table 2.3. Correlations between the scores at wave 1 and 2 (same interviewers) wave 2 and 3 (different interviewers) and 3 and 4 (same interviewers).

	Commitment Wave 1-2	Exploration Wave 1-2	Commitment Wave 2-3	Exploration Wave 2-3	Commitment Wave 3-4	Exploration Wave 3-4
1 life philosophy	.49	.65	.66	.63	.56	.61
2 parents	.71	.60	*			
3 friends	.33	.42	.58	.59	.66	.53
4 study-work-leisure	.43	.52	.59	.57	.43	.60
5 personal characteristics	.54	.79	.78	.71	.54	.69
6 intimate relationships	.75	.35				
7 Global identity	.44	.57	.82	.50	.65	.63

* missing values because of lack of variation

Validation: the relation with other variables

High levels of active coping, information oriented identity style, and ego development are expected to be positively related to exploration. High levels of passive and avoidant coping, of diffuse identity orientation are expected to be negatively related to exploration (Kunnen, Sappa, van Geert and Bonica, 2008)

High levels of active coping, information oriented identity style, autonomy, emotional stability, and ego development are expected to be positively related to commitment strength. High levels of passive and avoidant coping, of diffuse identity orientation are expected to be negatively related to commitment strength (Kunnen, Sappa, van Geert and Bonica, 2008)

The analysis are based on the sample of 89 psychology students.

Table 2.4. Significant correlations between Gids and different concepts.

Exploration		
Concept	Name of the instrument	correlation
Coping avoidant	UCL vermijden	-.21*
Coping Passive	UCL passief	-.33**
Emotional Stability Big Five	FFPI	-.25*
Information oriented identity	ISI info-scale	.28**
Ego-Development	ZALC	.50 **
Other coping, big five and ISI scales were not significant.		
Commitment		
Concept	Name of the instrument	correlation
Coping active	UCL actief	.42**
Coping avoidant	UCL vermijden	-.32**
Coping passive	UCL passief	-.41**
Coping seeking support	UCL soc. steun	.22*
Extraversion Big Five	FFPI	.36**
Autonomy Big Five	FFPI	.33**
Conscientiousness Big Five	FFPI	.25*
Emotional Stability Big Five	FFPI	.32*
Diffused identity style	ISI diff	-.31*
Other coping, big five and ISI scales and ego identity were not significant.		

* = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$